



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,965	02/28/2002	Donald C. Likes	TT3973	1256

53362 7590 08/08/2006

HAMILTON & TERRILE. LLP
P.O. BOX 203518
AUSTIN, TX 78720

EXAMINER

BATES, KEVIN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/085,965

Applicant(s)

LIKES ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin Bates

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-15, 17-23, 25 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-15, 17-23, and 25-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on May 8, 2006.

Claims 7, 16, and 24 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-23, and 25-26 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-15, 17-22, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Britton (5491693) in view of Martino, II (5680551).

Regarding claims 1, 10, and 18, Britton teaches a method comprising:
obtaining a message from a first component of a software system (Column 8, lines 24 - 26; identifying a module to handle scheme-specific communication of the message (Column 8, lines 26 – 39); and using the module for communicating the message from the first component to a second component of the software system (Column 9, line 65 – Column 10, line 8), the communicating the message including using a first resource locator to identify the first component and using a second resource locator to identify the second component (Column 9, lines 49 – 65, where the system identifies the transport provider corresponding with the communication scheme that the message is to be

forwarded to, and a different transport provider when the message is going to a different component).

Britton does not explicitly indicate that the first and second resource locator including a first resource locator communication scheme indication portion, a first resource locator network node name indication portion, a first resource port identifier indication portion, and a first resource locator path indication portion.

Martino, II teaches a system for identifying a resource locator for scheme-specific communication of a message (Column 11, lines 44 – 49) that includes a first resource locator communication scheme indication portion, a first resource locator network node name indication portion, a first resource port identifier indication portion, and a first resource locator path indication portion (Column 13, lines 25 – 56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Martino's teaching of a resource locator file in Britton in order to provide more detailed information for transmission of the packet on the new communication scheme.

Regarding claims 2, 11, and 19, Britton teaches the method of claims 1, 10, and 18, wherein the communicating the message comprises using communication scheme-specific programming code of the module, wherein the first component does not comprise the communication scheme-specific programming code; and the second component does not comprise the communication scheme-specific programming code (Column 4, lines 27 – 36, where the different network operate under different protocols and can only get translated through the gateway).

Regarding claims 3, 13, and 20, Britton teaches the method of claims 1, 10, and 18 wherein the using the module for communicating the message comprises at least one of a group consisting of the following: using a communication scheme-specific transmitter for transmitting the message; and using a communication scheme-specific receiver for receiving the message (Column 5, lines 45 – 52).

Regarding claims 4, 14, and 21, Britton teaches the method of claims 1, 10, and 18 wherein the identifying the module comprises calling a communication scheme handler to identify the module (Column 8, lines 26 – 39).

Regarding claims 5, 15, and 22, Britton teaches the method of claims 4, 10, and 18 wherein the identifying the module comprises at least one of a group consisting of the following: requesting a transmitter server to identify the module; and requesting a receiver server to identify the module (Column 8, lines 26 – 39).

Regarding claims 8, 17, and 25, Britton teaches the method of claims 1, 10, and 18 wherein the communicating the message comprises: using a first communication scheme from the first resource locator for communicating with the first component; and using a second communication scheme from the second resource locator for communicating with the second component (Column 9, lines 49 – 65, where the system identifies the transport provider corresponding with the communication scheme that the message is to be forwarded to, and a different transport provider when the message is going to a different component).

Regarding claims 9 and 26, Man teaches the method of claims 8 and 25 wherein the first and second communication schemes are the same (Figure 5, where the schemes can be the same when sending to the same node or network).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 12, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Britton in view of Martino, II as applied to claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-15, 17-22, and 25-26 above, and further in view of Man (5710908).

Regarding claims 6, 12, and 23, Britton teaches the method of claims 1, 10, and 18.

Britton does not explicitly indicate that the communicating the message comprises using a common interface for the first component and the second component.

Man teaches a scheme-specific communication method wherein the communicating the message comprises using a common interface for the first component and the second component (Column 7, lines 11 – 12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Man's teaching of a common interface with multiple protocol

schemes in Britton's system in order to allow it to interface with a heterogeneous LAN with supports multiple protocols operating on one network.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KB

KB
August 4, 2006


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER